

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI

FELICIA BROCK,	:	Case No. 1:19-cv-915
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
HAMILTON COUNTY SHERIFFS, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

---

ENTRY AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTIONS (DOC. 5) AND ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (DOC. 4)

---

This action is before the Court on Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 5) to Magistrate Judge Litkovitz's Report and Recommendations (Doc. 4). Magistrate Judge Litkovitz recommends that the Court dismiss the Plaintiff's complaint with prejudice. (Doc. 4.) Plaintiff objected to Magistrate Litkovitz's Report and Recommendations (Doc. 5.) This matter is now ripe for the Court's review.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), the Court has made a de novo review of the record in this case. Upon said review, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Objections (Doc. 5) are not well-taken and are accordingly **OVERRULED**. The Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendations (Doc. 4) in its entirety.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:**

1. Plaintiff's complaint is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
2. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a), it is hereby certified that an appeal of this

Order would not be taken in "good faith" and therefore Plaintiff is **DENIED** leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff remains free to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. See *Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803 (6th Cir. 1999), overruling in part *Floyd v. United States Postal Serv.*, 105 F.3d 274, 277 (6th Cir. 1997).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By:   
JUDGE MATTHEW W. McFARLAND